UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/177,700	10/23/98	GARDELL S	97-813

LM02/0516

LEONARD C SUCHYTA
GTE SERVICE CORPORATION
MAILCODE: HQE03G13
600 HIDDEN RIDGE
IRVING TX 75038

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, H	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2738	5

DATE MAILED: 05/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/177,700	Gardell et al.
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Hanh Nguyen	2738

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____

☒ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kumar et al.** (US Pat. No. 6,006,253) in view of **Pepper et al.** (US Pat. No. 5,930,700).

- Regarding claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 and 10 **Kumar et al.** discloses, in Fig.1, a Gateway 122 that communicates between PSTN 170 and computer H.323 terminals. The gateway 122 provides appropriate conversions between different network types (a Gateway in communication with a switch circuit network and translates PSTN signals into computer network signals). See col.3, lines 5-37. A Multipoint Control Unit 126 (MCU) in which a Manager Control (MC) is included is connected with the gateway 122 and H.324 terminals. The MCU 126 may be located in the gateway 122, Gatekeeper 124 or stands alone to receive signals from H.324 terminals and forward them to a respective terminal such as H.323 terminal. The MCU 126 also performs video switching or mixing and transmits the resulting media streams back to the terminal (a signal routing agent communicates with gateway, receives incoming calls from the gateway). See

col.3, lines 30-50 and col.4, lines 30-45. **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the signal routing agent is programmed to simultaneously transmit plural line appearance signals to the selected terminal. **Pepper et al.** disclose, in Fig.3, a service control module 306 that is in communication with subscriber 's PDA 200. The PDA 200 connects with programmed software which is stored in database 208 to automatically transmit appearance signals to the screen of the PDA 200 via a graphical user interface (GUI). The GUI is represented as a screen in Fig.7 (transmits appearance signals to the selected terminal). See col.5, lines 20-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the programmed software and GUI of **Pepper et al.** into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to transmit to subscribers' terminals new appearance messages from callers.

- Regarding claim 3, **Kumar et al.** discloses ,in Fig.2B, H.323 terminals within panel 210 communicate with the MCU 220 in a point-to-point manner on the H.245 control channel 222 and audio, video channel 228 (signal routing agent is in communication with respective terminals). See col.4, lines 30-45.

- Regarding claim 4, **Kumar et al.** discloses substantially the limitations of this claim in claim 1 above, except a configuration database storing terminal information. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.3, a database 308 that contains a copy of subscriber's phone book. See col.5, lines 33-40. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the database 308 of **Pepper et al.** 's system into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to store information such as phone numbers.

- Regarding claim 5, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the database comprises an association table. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.8, a phone book screen 800 which provides a database for maintaining a list of names 806, phone numbers 808, and addresses 810. All of theses are arranged in a table. See col.9, lines 10-20. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to adapt the table database of **Pepper et al.** 's into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to determine the terminal corresponding to the dialed number.

- Regarding claim 9, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 1, except for at least one gate keeper in communication with the gateway, and controls the gateway to transmit signals to the signal routing agent. **Kumar et al.** discloses, in Fig.1, a Gatekeeper 124 that provides control access over network 110 in such a way the gatekeeper 124 is connected with the gateway 122 and MCU 126 (at least one gate keeper in communication with the gateway, and controls the gateway to transmit signals to the signal routing agent). See col.3, lines 40-50.

- Regarding claim 11, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose a second Gatekeeper that connects to the first Gatekeeper. However, it is well known in the art to add a second Gatekeeper that connects to the first Gatekeeper, signal routing agent. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to add a second Gatekeeper into network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to locate a gatekeeper that services a particular dialed number.

- Regarding claims 12 and 14, the limitations of these claims have been addressed in claim 7.

- Regarding claim 13, the limitation of this claim has been addressed in claim 6.

- Regarding claim 15, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claim 1. Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

- Regarding claim 16, **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the step of displaying which comprises scrollable list of the plural line appearances. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.7, a main menu screen 700. The screen 700 provides a window 706 which lists recently received messages and indicates the origin of the call, the type of the call . See col.8, lines 60-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the menu screen 700 of **Pepper et al.** as a scrollable list of line appearances in **Kumar et al.** so that the called party can decide whether to response the incoming calls or not.

- Regarding claims 17 and 18, these claims are directed to the same subject matter claim 1, except for the following: **Kumar et al.** does not disclose a database that determines terminals corresponding to the dialed number. **Pepper et al.** discloses, in Fig.3, a database 308 that communicates with the PDA 200. The database 308 may contain a copy of the subscriber 's Phone book and Date book databases. Preferably, the database 308 automatically synchronizes with the information stored in the subscriber 's PDA 200 (a database that determines terminals corresponding to the dialed number). See col.5, lines 30-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the database 308 of **Pepper et al.** 's system into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to determine terminals corresponding to dialed number.

- Regarding claim 19, this claim is directed to the same subject matter claims 1 and 17. Therefore, it is subject to the same rejection.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/14/2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1, 9, 17 and 19, Applicant argues that neither **Kumar et al.** nor **Pepper et al.** discloses a signal routing agent. The signal routing agent receives plural incoming calls and simultaneously transmits plural line appearance signals corresponding to the incoming calls to a selected terminal. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant 's argument because Kumar et al. discloses, in Figures 2A, 2B, a loosely-coupled conference 200. The conference 200 includes a H.323 panel 210 and at least one of RTP receiver terminals 256 in a large group 250. The H.323 panel 210 has a multipoint controller 220 (signal routing agent) that is coupled with H.323 terminals to receive and transmit media streams to receiver terminals 256. The H.323 panel 210 is connected with a gateway 122 as shown in Fig.1 (Signal routing agent that receives and transmits plural incoming calls to terminal). See col.3 line 60 to col.4, lin 30. Eventhough **Kumar et al.** does not disclose the transmitted incoming calls to at least one of receiver terminals 256 correspond to line appearance signals. **Pepper et al.** discloses , in Fig.3, a service control module 306 that is in communication with subscriber 's PDA 200. The PDA 200 connects with programmed software which is stored in database 208 to automatically transmit

information such as subscriber's phonebook and datebook (line appearance signals) to the screen of the PDA 200 via a graphical user interface (GUI). Fig.8 shows a screen of phone book and Fig.9 shows a screen of date book (transmits appearance signals to the selected terminal). See col.5, lines 20-45. Therefore, it would have been obvious in the art at the time the invention was made to use the programmed software and GUI of **Pepper et al.** into the network 110 as disclosed by **Kumar et al.** to transmit to subscribers' terminals.

It is noted at no where in the specification that the CCSE16 (Signal Routing Agent) **simultaneously** transmits multiple incoming calls to a selected terminal. Therefore, the **simultaneously** transmits multiple incoming calls to a selected terminal is not supported by the specification.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-5445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou, can be reached on (703) 305-4744. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to :

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

or faxed to : (703) 308-6743 or (703) 305-3988

For informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"or"DRAFT"

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Dr.

Arlington VA, Sixth floor (Receptionist)

Hanh Nguyen

May 10, 2000

HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700